



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,423	02/26/2004	Richard Alan Oleson	BU129/0BU26-U	4739
24350	7590	06/02/2004	EXAMINER	
STITES & HARBISON, PLLC 400 W MARKET ST SUITE 1800 LOUISVILLE, KY 40202-3352			LINDSEY, RODNEY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3765	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/787,423

Applicant(s)

OLESON, RICHARD ALAN

Examiner

Rodney M. Lindsey

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews III in view of Lane '891. With respect to claims 1, 8 and 9 Andrews III shows a helmet comprising two interfaces 15 and two pairs of brackets 20, 35 (Figures 3 and 6) with mating ends 25, 26 and pivot point ends 21, 36 for establishing pivot axes as at 23, 37. The difference between Andrews III and claims 1, 8 and 9 is that Andrews III does not teach the interfaces 15 secured to an interior surface of the helmet. Lane '891 at interfaces/bases 30 teaches old their securing to an interior surface of the helmet. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to mount the interfaces 15 of Andrews III to an interior surface of the helmet in the manner of bases 30 of Lane '891 to achieve an alternative interface location that still affords ease of removal of support structure from the interface. Further with respect to claims 8 and 9 note the different pivot axis locations effected by the openings 23 and 37 of Andrews III. With respect to claim 2 note the midway location of the interfaces 15 of Andrews III. With respect to claim 3 note the midway location of the pivot axis at 23 of Andrews III. With respect to claims 4 and 5 in that in Andrews III the second pivot axis as at 37 is located different from the first pivot axis as at 23 it may be characterized as being more forward or more rearward than the first pivot axis as broadly claimed. With respect to claim 6 note the use of

Art Unit: 3765

goggles or a face shield in Andrews III (see column 1, line 11). With respect to claim 7 note the prongs 26 on the mating ends of the brackets of Andrews III.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews III in view of Lane '891 as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Hellberg. Andrews III does not teach clearly the forward location of the second pivotal axis. Hellberg teaches old to define on a bracket an arm 14 having an opening for defining a pivotal axis forward of the location of the helmet interface at 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a pair of the brackets of Andrews III such that the opening is defined forward of the opening in another pair of the brackets in the manner of Hellberg at 14 to achieve the advantage of accommodating a particularly designed face shield.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews III in view of Lane '891 as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Jamieson. Andrews III does not teach clearly the rearward location of the second pivotal axis. Jamieson teaches old to define on a bracket 28 an arm having an opening for defining a pivotal axis rearward of the location of the helmet interface at 23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a pair of the brackets of Andrews III such that the opening is defined rearward of the opening in another pair of the brackets in the manner of Jamieson at 28 to achieve the advantage of accommodating a particularly designed helmet accessory. With respect to claim 6 note the use of goggles or a face shield in Andrews III (see column 1, line 11).

Art Unit: 3765


Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note particularly, the pivot openings of the brackets of Oleson, Lane '609 and Simpson et al., the brackets of Kubnick, Seres et al., Paulson et al., Pernicka et al. and Wang Lee, the helmet accessories of Palmaer, Sakai and Malcom, Jr. and the inner surface location of the interfaces 72 of Burns et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney M. Lindsey whose telephone number is (703) 305-7818. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John J. Calvert can be reached on (703) 305-1025. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Rodney M. Lindsey
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3765

rml